



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/515,575	02/29/2000	Daniele V. Levy	002801.P013	9778

7590 09/22/2006
Andre L Marais
Blakley Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

HARBECK, TIMOTHY M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3628

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/515,575	Applicant(s) LEVY ET AL.	
	Examiner Timothy M. Harbeck	Art Unit 3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-19,21-31 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-19,21-31 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/26/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-19, 21-31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conklin (US Pat No 6,141,653) in view of <http://web.archive.org/web/19991122070012/pages.ebay.com/services/forum/feedback.html> (hereinafter EBay, via the Wayback Machine archive, published on 11/10/1999) in view of <http://web.archive.org/web/19991122031437/http://pages.ebay.com/help/basics/feedback.html#3>. (hereinafter FAQ, via the Wayback Machine archive, published on 11/10/1999)

Conklin discloses a system for interactive, multivariate negotiations over a network including:

- Identifying a plurality of transactions associated with a first user, the plurality of transactions comprising completed transactions, facilitated by the network the network-based transaction facility, in which the first user participated with at least one other user (Column 14, lines 21-26)
- Communicating user interface information from the network-based transaction facility to a client associated with the first user (Column 14,

Art Unit: 3628

lines 21-26) via a communication network (Column 14, lines 38-46), the user interface information including transaction information concerning at least first and second transactions of the plurality of transactions associated with the first user (Column 14, lines 21-26).

Conklin does not disclose the steps of

- Specifying a single feedback interface facilitating user input feedback information for each of the at least first and second of the plurality of transactions; and
- Receiving at the network-based transaction facility, the feedback information provided by the first user through the single feedback interface, for each of at least the first and second transactions, the feedback information being received via the communications network

EBay is a screen shot, via the Wayback Machine, of the EBay website, a popular Internet auction facilitator at the time of invention. The document outlines the feedback procedures of EBay concerning transactions of its users. This implies that the network based transaction facility receives the feedback information from the user, as it is catalogued for future users to see (page 1). Furthermore FAQ is a further link from Ebay (see numeral 6 "Feedback FAQ") As outlined on the page a user can if they wish "leave transaction-related feedback about a specific buy or sell transaction." This means that for each transaction the user was a party to, feedback can be left for the respective counterparty.

It would have been obvious to someone skilled in the ordinary art to include the teachings of EBay and FAQ to the disclosure of Conklin so that a future user will have information regarding the past transactions of potential counterparties to a transaction. The user can then determine if the potential counterparty is a reputable user of the system or if prior users have had problems with them in previous transactions.

Re Claim 3 and 4: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses identifying the completed transactions as transactions in which the first user participated as a buyer and the at least one user participated as a seller and vice versa (See Top of Page 1). EBay discloses that both sellers and buyers can receive feedback and therefore a user of the system could be either a buyer or a seller.

Re Claim 5: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and FAQ further discloses the method wherein the identifying comprises identifying the completed transaction in which the first user participated within a predetermined time period (See Page 2). EBay lists the transactions of the user over the past 60 days.

Re Claim 6: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses the step wherein the communication of the user interface information comprises communicating a markup language document and wherein the transaction information includes text information describing at least the first and second transaction (See Page 1). The page shows a rating system using a markup language format and also notes that users can leave comments in the feedback.

Re Claim 7: Conklin in view of Ebay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses the step wherein the user interface information defines a respective feedback input field associated with each of the first and second transactions via which the feedback information for each of at least the first and second transactions is user-inputted (See Page 1). EBay notes that a list of transactions for a user is given and that user feedback can be given concerning each transaction. EBay also discloses that “comments” (user-inputted) can be left on a feedback profile.

Re Claims 8 and 9: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses the step wherein the user interface information defines a type indicator via which type information, indicating a feedback type for the feedback information for each of the at least first and second transactions, is user inputted (See Page 1). EBay discloses that the user can indicate a feedback type of either a positive, neutral or negative, and that it is user inputted.

Re Claim 10: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and while the references do not explicitly disclose wherein the type indicator comprises any one of a group including a collection of check boxes and a collection of radio boxes, however these methods of indicating a selection via a computer software program were well known in the art at the time of invention and would have been obvious.

Re Claim 11: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and while the references do not explicitly disclose the step wherein the sure interface information defines a respective skip indicator for each of the at least first and

Art Unit: 3628

second transactions and each skip indicator being user-selectable to indicate whether or not feedback is provided via the feedback indicator, the EBay reference notes that a user is not required to provide feedback on each transaction. While not necessarily containing a skip button, a user can perform the same function by simply not leaving feedback and simply closing the interface.

Re Claim 12: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and while the references do not explicitly disclose wherein the skip indicator comprises any one of a group including a collection of check boxes and a collection of radio boxes, however these methods of indicating a selection via a computer software program were well known in the art at the time of invention and would have been obvious for to allow the user to quickly skip the feedback option if they do not wish to comment.

Re Claim 13: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and while the references do not explicitly disclose the step wherein the user interface information defines a filter input field via which a filter criteria is user-inputted, the filter criteria being applied to the plurality of transactions to define a subset thereof for display via the feedback interface, it was well known in the art at the time of invention to include a filter step in a search process. The Conklin reference discloses that users can search and evaluate seller information (Column 14, lines 3-4), which would include feedback information from other users. A filter process in this search would be obvious to help a user remove erroneous information and focus on the subset to which they are interested.

Re Claim 14: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses wherein the filter criteria comprises a user identifier identifying a second user associated with at least one transaction of the plurality of transactions (Page 1). EBay notes that a user can search for a particular buyer or seller's feedback profile using the user name associated with that account.

Re Claim 15: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and FAQ further discloses wherein the filter criteria comprises a transaction identifier identifying at least one of a plurality of transactions (Page 2). The reference notes that you can leave feedback for a single transaction so there must be a way to filter out this transaction from a plurality of transactions.

Re Claim 16: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and FAQ further discloses populating a feedback structure with the feedback information for each of the at least first and second transactions (Page 2). FAQ notes a page where a user will be able to leave feedback for other members to which they have been party to a transaction to within the last 60 days. If the user has engaged in a number of transactions within the last 60 days, then the feedback information for each of these transactions would be available on this page.

Re Claim 17: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses wherein the transaction information includes any one of a group including user, item, description, and date information (Page 1-2). EBay notes that a User ID of the counterparty is associated with all transactions as well as the

Art Unit: 3628

date of the transaction and furthermore it is well known in the art that other information such as the item and a description of the item in the transaction information.

Re Claim 18: Conklin discloses a system for interactive, multivariate negotiations over a network comprising the step of:

- Displaying transaction identification information for each of a plurality of transactions within the single user interface displayed on a display device, the plurality of transactions comprising completed transactions, facilitated by the computerized transaction facility, in which the first user participated with at least one other user (Column 14, lines 21-26).
A user can retrieve the information for display at any time.

Conklin does not explicitly disclose the following:

- Displaying a feedback input for each of the plurality of transactions within the single user interface as displayed on the display device
- Wherein each feedback input is displayed so as to indicate as association with respective transaction identification information and wherein each feedback input comprises an input field to receive at least one of text, numeric and alpha numeric information.

EBay is a screen shot, via the Wayback Machine, of the EBay website, a popular Internet auction facilitator at the time of invention. The document outlines the feedback procedures of EBay concerning transactions of its users. This implies that the network based transaction facility receives the feedback information from the user, as it is catalogued for future users to see (page 1). Furthermore FAQ is a further link from

Art Unit: 3628

Ebay (see numeral 6 "Feedback FAQ") As outlined on the page a user can if they wish "leave transaction-related feedback about a specific buy or sell transaction." This means that for each transaction the user was a party to, feedback can be left for the respective counterparty.

It would have been obvious to someone skilled in the ordinary art to include the teachings of EBay and FAQ to the disclosure of Conklin so that a future user will have information regarding the past transactions of potential counterparties to a transaction. The user can then determine if the potential counterparty is a reputable user of the system or if prior users have had problems with them in previous transactions.

Re Claim 19: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and Conklin further discloses the step wherein the transaction identification information includes any one of a group including user information identifying a party to a transaction, item information identifying a subject of a transaction and date information indicating a date associated with the transaction period (Column 14, lines 21-26).

Re Claim 21: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses the step wherein the feedback input comprises at least one of a plurality of user-selectable feedback options (Page 1). EBay discloses allowing the user to select between positive, negative or neutral feedback comments.

Re Claim 22: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and while the references do not explicitly disclose the step wherein the plurality of user selectable feedback options are presented in the form of a drop-down menu, the use of drop down menus in software applications was well known in the art at the time

Art Unit: 3628

of invention. It would have been obvious to someone skilled in the ordinary art at the time of invention to include drop down menus to allow a user to quickly select an option amongst a plurality of options.

Re Claim 23 and 24: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses the steps wherein the plurality of user-selectable feedback options are type options that indicate a feedback type associated to feedback information and wherein the feedback type includes any one of a group including positive feedback, negative feedback and neutral feedback (Page 1). EBay discloses allowing the user to select between different types of feedback comments including positive, negative or neutral feedback comments.

Re Claim 25: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and while the references do not explicitly disclose wherein the plurality of user selectable feedback options are presented as being user selectable by any of a group including a plurality of check boxes and a plurality of radio buttons, however these methods of indicating a selection via a computer software program were well known in the art at the time of invention and would have been obvious for to allow the user to quickly select a predetermined option.

Re Claim 26: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and while not explicitly disclosing the step of displaying a skip input for each of the plurality of transactions within the user interface, each skip input being user-selectable to indicate whether or not feedback is being provided for associated transaction identification information, the EBay reference notes that a user is not

Art Unit: 3628

required to provide feedback on each transaction. While not necessarily containing a skip button, a user can perform the same function by simply not leaving feedback and simply closing the interface.

Re Claim 27: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and Conklin further discloses the step wherein the user interface comprises a markup language document displayed within a browser (Column 2, lines 12-22)

Re Claim 28: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses the step wherein the association is indicated by display of respective feedback input proximate the specific transaction identification information (Page 1-2). The EBay reference notes that most members leave messages about a buy or sell transaction and that a user can also receive a quick summary of feedback messages left about others pertaining to specific transactions.

Re Claim 29: Conklin in view of EBay and FAQ discloses the claimed method supra and EBay further discloses the step wherein the association is indicated by display of a graphical indication that indicates the association between the respective feedback input and the specific transaction identifier information (Page 2). The EBay reference discloses the use of a point system relating to the tone of feedback. If a user receives 10 or more comments, a star icon will appear next to the name. The color of the star varies with the number of positive or negative comments.

Re Claim 30: Conklin discloses a system for interactive multivariate negotiations over a network including the steps of:

Art Unit: 3628

- Identifying a plurality of items, the plurality of items being items transacted between a user and at least one other user utilizing the network-based transaction facility (Column 14, lines 21-26)

Conklin does not disclose the following steps

- Communicating user interface information to a client via a communications network, the user interface information including item information from the network-based transaction facility concerning at least first and second items of the plurality of items and specifying a single input interface facilitating user input of comments
- Receiving, at the network-based transaction facility, the comments provided by the user through the single input interface, for each of the at least first and second items, the comments being received via the communications network

EBay is a screen shot, via the Wayback Machine, of the EBay website, a popular Internet auction facilitator at the time of invention. The document outlines the feedback procedures of EBay concerning transactions of its users. This implies that the network based transaction facility receives the feedback information from the user, as it is catalogued for future users to see (page 1). Furthermore FAQ is a further link from EBay (see numeral 6 "Feedback FAQ") As outlined on the page a user can if they wish "leave transaction-related feedback about a specific buy or sell transaction." This

Art Unit: 3628

means that for each transaction the user was a party to, feedback can be left for the respective counterparty.

It would have been obvious to someone skilled in the ordinary art to include the teachings of Ebay and FAQ to the disclosure of Conklin so that a future user will have information regarding the past transactions of potential counterparties to a transaction. The user can then determine if the potential counterparty is a reputable user of the system or if prior users have had problems with them in previous transactions.

Re Claim 31: Conklin discloses a system for interactive multivariate negotiations over a network including the steps of:

- Displaying item identification information for each of a plurality of items within the single user interface displayed on a display device the plurality of items being items transacted between a user and at least one other user utilizing the network-based transaction facility (Column 14, lines 21-26).

Conklin does not disclose the following:

- Displaying a comment input for each of the plurality of items within the single user interface as displayed on the display device
- Wherein each component input by a user is displayed so as to indicate an association with respective transaction identification information and wherein each comment input by the user comprises an input field to receive at least one of text, numeric and alpha-numeric information

Art Unit: 3628

EBay is a screen shot, via the Wayback Machine, of the EBay website, a popular Internet auction facilitator at the time of invention. The document outlines the feedback procedures of EBay concerning transactions of its users. This implies that the network based transaction facility receives the feedback information from the user, as it is catalogued for future users to see (page 1). Furthermore FAQ is a further link from Ebay (see numeral 6 "Feedback FAQ") As outlined on the page a user can if they wish "leave transaction-related feedback about a specific buy or sell transaction." This means that for each transaction the user was a party to, feedback can be left for the respective counterparty.

It would have been obvious to someone skilled in the ordinary art to include the teachings of EBay to the disclosure of Conklin so that a future user will have information regarding the past transactions of potential counterparties to a transaction. The user can then determine if the potential counterparty is a reputable user of the system or if prior users have had problems with them in previous transactions.

Re Claim 34: Further system claim would have been obvious to perform the previously rejected method claim 1 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/26//2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant has claimed that the references do not show a single feedback interface that is capable of providing feedback information for multiple transactions. However the references explicitly state that while most members leave messages about a buy or sell transaction, you can leave a message about anything (page 2). Furthermore the claim language indicates that the transactions are completed via participation with at least one other user. This would include completing multiple transactions with only one other user. The examiner believes that the references supplied disclose this feature in that a user can leave feedback for a particular user, "about anything." In the instance where multiple transactions occur between the same two participants, an instance that is well known in the art and in particular via Ebay, one feedback loop can be used to send comments about any or all of the transactions with the other user. This is more efficient than sending feedback for each transaction, as the intended recipient is the same. In this case a single feedback loop is utilized for multiple transactions. The examiner therefore maintains the previous rejections.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any


Art Unit: 3628

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy M. Harbeck whose telephone number is 571-272-8123. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough can be reached on 571-272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
